DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 833 EC 140 347

AUTHOR Brady, Michael P.; Anderson, Daniel D.
TITLE Some Issues in the Implementation of P.L. 94-142 in the Pacific Basin Territories.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at The Council for Exceptional Children Conference on The Exceptional Bilingual Child (New Orleans, LA, February 18-20, 1981, Session P-14).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compliance (Legal); *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Handicap Identification; Problems; *Program Implementation; *Sociocultural Patterns; Student Placement; Teacher Education; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Education for All Handicapped Children Act; *Pacific Trust Territories

ABSTRACT

Problems facing the Pacific Basin Territories' attempt to implement P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, include lack of felt need for services to mildly handicapped students, lack of accommodation for cultural values in the law, and confused communications concerning the development of special education. Further difficulties directly related to cultural values are encountered in the identification/assessment mandate, the process of planning individualized educational programs, placement and services, and personnel preparation. Encouraging trends have included funding of a successful technical assistance project, development of special education degree programs in Guam and Micronesia, and an effective approach to inservice training in American Samoa. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EC 193

ED209833

Some Issues in the Implementation of P.L. 94-142 in the Pacific Basin Territories

Michael P. Brady

Special Education Division, Pago Pago, American Samoa

Daniel D. Anderson

Pacific Basin Consortium, Honolulu, Hawaii

A Paper Presented to

The Council for Exceptional Children Convention

New Orleans, Louisiana

February 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Daniel D. Anderson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 140347

The authors wish to thank Dr. Luanna Voeltz, Special Education Department, University of Hawaii for her valuable contributions and support. They also wish to thank Amy Yamashita for her many hours of assistance with the manuscript.

Running Head: Implementation of P.L. 94-142 in the Pacific Basin

Some Issues in the Implementation of P.L. 94-142 in the Pacific Basin Territories

Implementation of P.L. 94-142, though sometimes difficult, has progressed to the point of making a very positive impact in the continental United States. However, extending the mainland-oriented legislation to the U.S. Pacific Basin territories of American Samoa, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (which, in 1981, will become the Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and Belau) has been seriously questioned by Pacific educators. Many educators recognize that full compliance with P.L. 94-142 is often in direct opposition to local traditional and cultural values, and unrealistic in terms of island economic conditions.

Cultural values, economic needs, and massive logistical problems facing Pacific Islanders were not considered in the development of the federal legislation. Therefore, Pacific Island compliance has become one of the largest challenges to face educators in the history of the territories.

The present Pacific Island territories comprise over 2,000 islands that are scattered throughout a geographic region substantially larger than the continental United States. However, the total land mass is smaller than the state of Massachusetts and the total population is just over 250,000. The political status of each island territory and the type of association with the U.S. have been rapidly changing.

Citizenship has been granted to residents of Guam, although Guamanians are prevented from voting in U.S. elections. Additionally, American Samoans are U.S. nationals and are permitted free access to and from the United States. Recent negotiations between the newly developed, separate entities in the Trust Territories and the U.S. call for internal self government for the islands with complex security and defense ties to the U.S.

In addition to the native populations of each island group, a number of Japanese, Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, and Americans form at least a dozen distinct cultural groups, each with its own unique values and traditions. English is a second language and is only one of at least nine major languages, with numerous regional dialects.

Special education services in the Pacific territories were first implemented during the late 1960's and early 1970's. During this time, services in the mainland U.S. were being refined via court action, state legislation, and, finally, federal legislation. Refinement included the recognition that services for the disabled should include methods and goals that are culturally accepted as normal. Wolfensberger (1972) refined previous works to define the normalization principle to mean, "utilization of means which are as culturally normative as possible to establish or maintain personal behaviors and characteristics which are as culturally normative as possible." Some early special education programs in the territories reflected Wolfensberger's definition. Standards for services were consistent with local values. In addition, services reflected the state of the island economies and

the ability to deliver related services such as health services.

The territory of Guam has the most advanced health and education services. Having the largest population (100,000), a strong economy, and a long history of involvement with American education models, Guam developed special education services relatively quickly. Other territories with small and remote populations, very limited economic resources, and relatively little experience with universal education, have yet to develop comprehensive special education services that are meaningful by U.S. standards.

Public Law 94-142 is one of the many forces that influence change in the Pacific Island territories. The degree to which special education will be accepted and have a positive impact on services for the handicapped is dependent upon the implementation of the change process.

Niehoff (1966), in a discussion of the social change process, suggests that "in general, the role which the innovator /of change/ plays, and particularly his techniques /in relation to the process/ are the most important ingredients in the change process." Niehoff lists a number of different kinds of forces or variables that impact on the process of change. He notes that six variables are most important. Those variables are: (a) the communication methods used by the change agent; (b) the kind of participation obtained from the recipients of change; (c) the manner in which the existing cultural patterns are utilized; (d) whether there is a felt need for change; (e) whether the recipients perceive any benefit in adopting the change; and (F) whether traditional leaders are involved in the planning and implementation of

the change. The most important variables for a successful change process are reviewed briefly in relation to the implementation of special education in the Pacific Island territories.

Communication, from agents of change, has not been clear or consistent. In part, the problem is that there have been many "agents" of change. Communication regarding special education has come from funding agencies, other government agencies, consultants, individuals providing technical assistance, and any number of individuals just trying to be helpful. Each source of information contributes to confused communications concerning the development of special education in the Pacific Islands.

Participation by recipients of change is another variable that was not well managed in the past. Although practices differed from territory to territory, the initial participation by Pacific Islanders was very limited. Part of the problem related to the time necessary for Islanders to receive specialized training. Another factor in limiting participation was the use of contract workers to administer special education programs. As an example, American Samoa utilized contract directors of special education up until 1979. Although teachers of special education have been Pacific Islanders, those in administrative and decision making positions have, only recently, been Pacific Islanders. Another way of viewing the variable of participation is to examine the amount of fiscal support that local territorial governments provide to special education programs. Only the territory of Guam provides major local funding for special education. To a

lesser degree, local funding is provided in American Samoa. The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the Trust Territory are almost totally funded by federal resources.

The utilization of existing cultural patterns is considered an important variable in the change process. This paper briefly discusses the fact that special education, like other formal educational programs, was introduced by American educators and that few existing "informal" cultural patterns of education were incorporated into the educational programs. Although Pacific educators are beginning to explore ways of relating formal and informal education, little has been accomplished in the area of special education.

The question of "felt need" for change is a difficult issue to address. In regard to some of the more mildly handicapping conditions, there is little or no felt need for special education services. Many of the youngsters with mild disabilities function very well in the uncomplicated, family-oriented island communities. The American education models that meet the needs of the mildly handicapped were designed for children in more complicated, technical communities than those of the Pacific Islands. Thus, from many Islanders' point of view, there may be no need for some services and certainly not the kind of service designed for American urban communities. On the other hand, there is agreement on the fact that severely handicapped children have special needs. However, there is no agreement on the appropriateness of American special education models for serving the severely handicapped who live in the Pacific Islands.

Another variable in the process of change is the perceived benefit in adopting the proposed change. One benefit, of course, is the economic benefit of federal support for programs and employment. The benefits of special education programs for children are less clear. There is simply too little evidence to demonstrate that the majority of handicapped children are better able to function in their Pacific Island environment as a result of special education services. There is a growing body of data on program development and case-by-case change. Unfortunately, no organized program evaluation or research is taking place.

The last major successful change variable listed by Niehoff is involvement of traditional leaders. Once again, the record is mixed. Some programs have made an effort to involve traditional leaders in, at least, some special education activities. American Samoa, for example, has reported the coordination of their "childfind" activities with the traditional village leaders. For the most part, there is no clear role for traditional leaders in special education development.

Given the background provided by a brief review of Pacific Island special education in relation to the process of social change, the authors present an overview of the major components of special education as they have been implemented in the Pacific Island territories.

Identification/Assessment

The mandate to actively search for, locate, identify, and assess handicapped persons is clear. Indeed, childfind procedures in the Pacific territories have been implemented. Activities often include

village by village searches, media blitzes, and presentations to traditional leaders. However, in the territories there are differing perceptions of what constitutes a handicapping condition. Valid and reliable non-discriminatory assessment devices are not available. The economic and social norms of island communities can render mainland model childfind efforts tenuous for everyone but the most obviously disabled individuals.

Furuno (1980) cites the lack of consensus in Micronesia as to the definition of "handicapped." Definitions ranging from no meaning (Yap) to "helpless" (Saipan) to "crazy" (Ponape). She also points out that the rigorous standards for diagnosing handicapped children by Board-approved pediatricians, licensed and certified school psychologists, and speech pathologists has made the identification process "slow, if not frequently impossible" (p. 3) in many remote outer islands. Similarly, Sanchez (1977), former Deputy Chief of Vocational Rehabilitation in the Trust Territory, suggests there is no word for rehabilitation because rehabilitation is not a relevant concept in Micronesia.

The attempt to utilize U.S. mainland categories to describe handicapping conditions in Pacific territory populations may be one of the major impediments in identification. Welle (1979) notes that the Trust Territory's problems with identification categories such as educable mentally retarded, learning disabled, and emotionally disturbed results from the numerous languages spread thinly over hundreds of small islands. The fact that English is a second (or third or fourth)

language for the vast majority of Islanders contributes to identification problems. Welle indicates that it may be irrelevant curriculum and the poor quality of regular education instruction that leads to the identification of children with problems rather than "the inherent malfunctioning of the student" (Welle, 1979, p. 10). American Samoa annually reports children with "learning problems" rather than attempting to justify the existence of specific learning disabilities in Samoan culture (Note 1). Given the debate on the 5% to 40% incidence rate of a school population as learning disabled (Hammill, 1980), there is little support for utilization of mainland categorical models of identification in the territories. Similarly, the identification of sutdents as emotionally disturbed reflects the lack of objective, functional criteria that can be culturally adapted. Voeltz and Donellon (1978) reported wide variations in emotional disturbance in the Pacific: American Samoa does not report students as emotionally disturbed; Guam maintains only a separate juvenile justice school; and no emotionally disturbed program exists in the Trust Territory. In working with Japanese, Hawaiian, Samoan, and Filipino populations, Marsella (1980) reported wide differences in their concepts, manifestations, and preferred treatments of mental disorders and a tendency toward misdiagnosis of disorders by mainland mental health professionals. He noted that Western assessment procedures tended to attribute Western concepts of mental illness to deficiencies caused by parasites, malnutrition, or diseases common to underdeveloped countries. A wide incongruence existed between villagers' and researchers' views on who

in the village had a mental disorder. In working with Pacific Islanders and Navajos, Stubbins (1978) cited diagnostic problems in skill and psychological testing, soliciting medical symptoms, etc., due to language barriers and a lack of understanding of the purpose of the assessment.

Because there is no consensus on the existence or definition of mild or culturally determined emotional or behavioral handicaps, it is not surprising that, of 255 vocational rehabilitation cases recorded in the Trust Territory in 1977, only 16 were categorized as mental, psychoneurotic and personality disorders (Steinberg, 1978). To date, only the obviously handicapping conditions of serious hearing impairments, visual impairments, orthopedic impairments, and severe multiple handicaps regularly pass the nearly insurmountable obstacles of identification and eligibility for special education and support services (Caldwell, 1979; Steinberg, 1978; Voeltz & Donellon, 1978; Welle, 1979).

The difficulties inherent in the mainland categorical model have been countered in the Trust Territory by the adoption of generic categories of mildly, moderately, and severely handicapped. While the categories may evolve to more accurately reflect abilities, disabilities, or service models, it is important that what constitutes a handicapped student in the Pacific territories be viewed in terms of local perceptions of normal and abnormal behavior within each island community.

Traditionally, a child with a handicap is integrated into village life and given tasks relative to his/her abilities (Welle, 1979). Life in a Pacific Island extended family requires each family member to

assume a productive role. The contributions of any family member is not limited to providing financial support. There are many family roles to be filled and extended families can be huge by American standards. In the Trust Territory--and to a lesser degree the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and Guam--the family work involves subsistence farming and/or fishing. In the Trust Territory, only 25% of all males over the age of 15 years work in a money economy (Sanchez, 1978). Students labeled as mildly or moderately handicapped during school hours return home to become contributing members of the family and fully integrated into the "mainstream" of village life. Bellamy and Wilcox (1980) aptly remind us that "the goals of special education are to minimize the discrepancies between handicapped and non-handicapped individuals." However, by utilizing a mainland model for special education, we are discriminating against a population of students who function as a normal part of their village system by identifying them as handicapped on the basis of school performance.

Downing (1973) clearly demonstrates the stark differences in the priority and purpose of acquisition of literacy by various cultures. American culture places a very high value on reading and writing, matches that value to federal dollars, and exhibits a large degree of anxiety over students with reading problems. Pacific Islanders, however, have placed a stronger emphasis on traditional, non-formal education that stresses specific village-based skills.

Given that there is some question as to the appropriate applica-

bility of an American model for education in the Pacific territories (Bateman, 1972; Nevin, 1977; Sanchez, 1978; Voeltz & Donellon, 1978), utilizing that model for the identification of individuals as handicapped is doing a disservice to those individuals and their families. The investigation of non-formal village skill centered education and the development of appropriate curriculum for Pacific Islanders may well be the first step in the development of a meaningful system of identification and assessment of children with special needs.

Planning

The benefits of developing educational program plans (IEPs) for handicapped children are obvious. Educators have worked through some of the early problems associated with the planning process and are now able to develop IEPs with the best interests of a student's future in mind.

The process of developing IEPs involves a series of value-oriented activities such as: (a) considering a particular child as an individual for the purpose of developing an educational plan; (b) planning for the future educational program of that child by developing long term goals and objectives; (c) making decisions regarding those goals and objectives; and (d) documenting the outcome of the IEP process. However, those activities are culture specific and based on values (middle class American) that are different than the values held by many of the Pacific Island culture groups.

Table 1 has been utilized to display the relationship between the functions and activities of developing an individualized plan and the

value orientation of the two culture groups--Americans and Pacific Islanders. Teachers from both groups are involved in the development of IEPs, yet they bring with them very different value orientations.

Insert Table 1 about here

American culture values the individual, recognizes the individual for the potential that he/she might possess, and supports those activities which would maximize the growth of the individual.

Americans value the concept of individual freedom, equality, and opportunity, and place a good deal of faith in the potential for individual development.

In extending the right to education to severely handicapped persons, Schipper, Wilson and Wolf wrote:

> If it is possible to speak of the genius of a culture, the focus or concentration of its energies, or the ends toward which it historically inclines, the genius of the American culture might be the idea and ideal of the individual. For us the worth of the individual is the foundation of value; the well being of the individual is the chief object of social purpose and action. (1977, p. 6)

The value Americans place on individual rights is not universal. The Pacific Island extended family system results in values and behaviors that are often quite different from values and behaviors in the mainland United States. Robert and Varney (Note 2) compared school executives in Micronesia and the U.S. and found major differences in

attitudes and behaviors in such planning functions as budgeting, setting goals and objectives, predicting outcomes, developing policies, structuring organizations, stating qualifications for staff, training, and measuring and reporting results.

Pacific Island cultures developed in a physical environment that, by necessity, valued the group more than the individual. Each individual in the island community had to play cooperative, supportive roles so that the community, as a whole, might survive. Over hundreds of years, rigid social structures and divisions of labor developed. This social and cultural development was directed toward the stability of the community rather than the freedom of the individual. Individuals within Pacific Island cultures simply did not have, nor do they now have, the range of options for individual growth and development that one finds in the American culture. For example, the freedom of mobility and employment opportunities that one finds on the mainland United States does not exist in the Pacific Islands.

In the past, Pacific cultures valued non-competitive, cooperative relationships over individual, competitive behavior. Today, even with the dramatic social change that has taken place, Pacific cultures still place great value on non-individualistic, cooperative, non-competitive behavior. The individualized approach to the education of children does not have a strong value base in Pacific cultures.

Pacific peoples, perhaps because of their proximity to and dependence on nature, have learned to focus on meeting present needs and expecting little change.

Americans value change, are future oriented, and expect that as a result of hard work future objectives will be reached. The American orientation is to determine long range goals, develop objectives, and plan and implement activities that will result in a changed future. Change is valued.

The Pacific Islanders' experience is based on a naturally balanced society with little change and a present time orientation. "Nothing is expected to change, there was little reason for planning, and even today, Micronesians seem to give little consideration to the future" (Nevin, 1977, p. 48).

From a Pacific perspective, a teacher is more likely to focus upon a child's adjustment to the present environment and less likely to be concerned about the future. Thus, educational planning tends to be more present oriented with minimal expectations for future change.

Educational decision making reflects the value orientation of the decision maker. American teachers tend to utilize data and search for the most rational decision. Americans are becoming more comfortable in involving others in the decision making process but continue to seek the most efficient method for making a decision. The Pacific Island teacher is less likely to rely on data, more inclined to trust his/her feelings, and more comfortable with including others in a cooperative exchange that will result in a decision. However, some decisions would be made in the traditional society authoritarian style.

The American tends to deal in formalized ways with emphasis on written materials. And he's time-conscious, schedule-

> oriented. Most Pacific Islanders aren't time conscious . . . there is no institutionalized follow through, no way to get something in motion and expect it to follow an orderly, agreed upon scheduled path. (Nevin, 1977, p. 49)

English is a second language for nearly all Pacific Island teachers. Few have had the opportunity to develop the verbal and written skills of American teachers. Pacific Island teachers are less likely to utilize their written English skills in developing and documenting individualized educational program plans. Pacific Island teachers do not have the same value orientation toward the written word that the American teacher might have. Historically, the native Pacific languages were not written languages. The value in communication is placed on the present verbal interaction with people, not on the future use of a written document.

The Pacific Island teacher does not wish to be held to a documented plan. He/she would prefer the flexibility of planning day-to-day activities. His/her strength is in the emphatic understanding of the feelings of others, not in the use of a structured future oriented planning process.

Placement and Services

As each of the Pacific Island territories expands services for students with special needs, the need for alternative models of service delivery and the types of services provided becomes apparent. However, the development of placement options and support services in each of the territories has been severely limited by geography, shortages of trained staff, and federal restrictions on use of funds. The factors

that impact on the development of services to Pacific territories were not considered when P.L. 94-142 was extended to the Pacific Islands.

American Samoa and Guam built central special education facilities to serve a number of their special education students. The model was common throughout the U.S. several years ago. American Samoa and some Trust Territory districts have also invested in the development of home-based programs with itinerant teachers to serve low incidence children or students in difficult to reach villages. Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory, and, most recently, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands developed resource rooms in various schools to serve mildly handicapped children. Unfortunately, the attempt to find appropriate, alternate delivery models has not been entirely successful in meeting unique Pacific Island problems. For example, one oceanfront village in American Samoa, with two handicapped students, becomes isolated during high tide. Transportation difficulties were listed as one of two major factors blocking service delivery in American Samoa (Note 3). Rehabilitation officials in the Trust Territory had to purchase an inter-island boat and hire a boat operator in order to reach disabled clients in remote locations (Steinberg, 1978). With a small population spread out among 2,000 islands--many of which have no roads, harbors, airstrips, regular mail service, telephones, or electricity--accessibility is an obvious impediment to delivery of services.

There were no special education programs in the territories prior to 1967. Except for American Samoa and Guam, special education programs

are operated solely on federal funds. Caldwell (1979) reported that special education in the Trust Territory was initiated as a direct result of availability of federal funds. Given that the Trust Territory has a mixed subsistence and money economy, the lack of a tax base precludes the local governments from providing funds for even the most fundamental health or education program.

The establishment of community-based special education classes in village schools has been severely restricted in some of the territories due to limits on the use of federal funds. Unlike many mainland communities, the Pacific Islands are experiencing expanding populations and acute shortages of classroom space. Federal funding is the sole or major support of educational programs in the Pacific Island territories and, as such, must be used for construction. The restriction on the use of federal dollars for construction of school facilities has been called a "conditio sine qua non--a precondition without which no program . . . is possible here" (Note 4).

Providing basic educational services in the Pacific territories is challenging. However, P.L. 94-142's mandate to provide related services face even stiffer obstacles. Excluding Guam, none of the territories' economies have been able to effectively support even the most basic related services in a systematic manner. At times, itinerant teams of medical and support specialists from Hawaii or the mainland U.S. are utilized to provide services. Even so, irregular transportation to outer districts prevents delivery to the more remote populations. A lack of qualified personnel to carry out recommendations

is a problem for all territories. Physical and occupational therapy services, if available at all, are provided by "stateside" therapists who work on a contract basis. Contract employee recruitment is regularly hindered by factors such as low pay, professional isolation, "culture shock," and housing shortages. The presence of at least nine separate languages in a population of just over 250,000 persons, as well as the fact that English is a second language in the territories, has complicated the provision of speech/language services. Recently, a group of educators suggested the need for research regarding speech therapy models in the Pacific. There is a possibility that the high tolerance for linguistic variation and the low level demand for acquisition of language placed on young children may significantly alter the expected incidence rate of children with speech and language disorders in the Pacific Islands (Note 5).

Nevin (1977) reviewed many of the problems of relating irrelevant curriculum in the schools in Micronesia. For example, due to the uncertain political future of some territories, supporting bilingual education can be: (a) stylish, (b) status quo, or (c) politically dangerous. Currently, most regular education material throughout grades 3-12 in the territories is taught in English. Most remedial or special education classes are taught in the region's own language, utilizing English as a second language. A few early instructional efforts relied heavily on Distar and similar approaches. However, both the content and methodology of the islands' curriculum have been in a state of continual change. Commercial American curricula have

proven to be of dubious value in many instances. American Samoa and Guam have both attempted to generate locally developed curriculum. Caldwell (1979) reported a somewhat successful effort to extend a direct instruction/precision teaching technology to residents of Palau, Ponape, and the Marshalls during the late 1970's. However, he also found that special educators geared the curriculum toward a heavy emphasis on academics which hindered the development of more culturally relevant curriculum for handicapped Micronesian children.

Some recent trends on the mainland U.S. hold promise for providing relevant direction in curricula development. Brown et al. outlined criteria for teaching functional and culturally relevant skills in natural settings (Brown, Nietupski & Hamre-Nietupski, 1976); strategies for selecting relevant skills for curriculum development (Brown, Branston, Hamre-Nietupski, Pumpian, Certo & Gruenewald, 1979); and strategies for utilizing a student's current and future environments as factors in developing curricula (Brown, Bransten-McClean, Baumgart, Vincent, Falvy & Schroeder, 1979). Although the research was an outgrowth of work with severely handicapped students, the strategies are particularly appealing to Pacific educators who face a lack of both relevant curricula and educational settings.

Personnel Preparation

Pacific Island educators and administrators have long recognized the need for and the value of personnel preparation. In relation to the size of Pacific Island territories, each territory has made major investments of time, talent, and fiscal resources in training.

The unique Pacific Island problems that impact on the provision of special education services to children are the same problems that affect the training of the personnel that serve those children. The Pacific Basin Consortium, a federally funded personnel preparation project designed to assist departments of education in cooperative and coordinated efforts, has identified the following problem areas: (a) difficulties of communication and travel in an area covering millions of square miles; (b) small population groups that are isolated and geographically remote; (c) language and cultural barriers; (d) very limited financial resources; and (e) few professionally trained Pacific Islanders (Note 6).

One additional problem confronting those involved in personnel preparation in the Pacific Island territories is the variation of needs and resources to meet needs from territory to territory. On the one hand, if personnel preparation is to be coordinated and efficient, it must be viewed from a Pacific-wide perspective. On the other hand, the dramatic regional and sub-regional differences dictate that personnel preparation must be area-specific to be effective. To exemplify the differences, two territories are briefly described in terms of the extent to which teachers have received bachelor's level training. The Pacific Island territory with the most well developed special education service program is Guam. Guam is most like U.S. departments of education in that special education teachers meet base degree (bachelor's level) criteria. In addition, Guam has readily available resources for personnel preparation (University of Guam). Through the

process of developing a comprehensive system of personnel development, Guam, more than any other Pacific Island territory, has assessed personnel needs and has developed and implemented planned training activities to meet those needs.

Turning to the other territories, we find very different conditions with respect to the minimum standards for training. Also, the resources that are available to meet personnel training needs in the territories are very different from what one would expect in the mainland United States. The level of personnel preparation for special education staff from the four districts that compose the new Federated States of Micronesia (Truk, Ponape, Yap, and Kosrae) is presented as an example. A survey of special education staff--conducted by the Trust Territory in the fall of 1979 and reported in January 1981--indicates that: (a) only 10% of the special education staff in the sample have bachelor's level training; (b) 29% had not completed one year of college; (c) 22% had completed only one year of college; and (d) 33% had an associate degree or two years of training (Note 7).

Preliminary information on the present level of personnel preparation from the other Pacific Island territories is somewhat more encouraging. For example, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands reports that all their special education teachers have two years of college or associate degrees, although none have completed bachelor's degrees. Many of the special education teachers in American Samoa have completed their baccalaureate training. Unfortunately, accurate and complete information on personnel needs for many of the

islands is not presently available. At this time, the departments of education are working cooperatively, with the Pacific Basin Consortium, so that accurate data on personnel preparation needs will be available in mid-1981. Preliminary information, such as that noted above, does provide one with an idea of the present personnel needs in the Pacific Island territories.

When reviewing the history of special education in Pacific territories, one finds that many of the past efforts in personnel preparation have been disjointed, inefficient, and ineffective. Special education in the Pacific Islands, as well as other formal education programs, were imported from the United States. Therefore, personnel preparation activities were also imported. The first Americans on the scene defined the needs and determined what models of training would be used to meet the needs. Those first trainers turned to their own past experience for direction. The result was sometimes a mixed combination of mainland university consultants and transplanted program models.

Educators that implemented American programs and training models have not had long-term successful experiences. It appeared as though a program would remain in place only as long as its proponent was on contract to the territory government. At the end of the contract period, usually two years, the contract employee would leave and soon there would be little evidence of the program--except for the stack of program supplies and materials delivered many months after they were ordered.

In the past, few educators took the time to assist Pacific Islanders in the process of developing training programs appropriate for the culture and the region. The perception of need was often in relation to some American standard.

Activities relating to the assessment of personnel needs were not well planned or executed. It was as though "needs assessment" was a process of rationalizing everything--"teachers have little or no training in special education so anything we do will meet a need."

The use of short term consultants, in spite of the known limitations of such a training model, was frequently utilized because there seemed to be no other alternative for isolated and remote areas. As expected, the use of short term consultants made little positive impact on personnel preparation needs.

It was not until Pacific Islanders themselves received advanced training and returned to their communities that a constructive, proactive relationship with consultants could be developed. Americans who stayed beyond the initial contract period began making positive contributions. Americans that made the long term commitment to the people and the culture were in positions that enabled them to work with the well-trained Islanders on the development of appropriate personnel preparation programs. Consultants are still being used. However, the consultant is more often used to provide technical assistance or to support the local training effort that is now more Pacific Island oriented.

Improved resources within the Pacific Basin are being utilized

to meet Pacific Island needs. Two institutions of higher education provide most of the formal degree training in special education (Community College of Micronesia and University of Guam). Other universities in Hawaii and the mainland U.S. also provide special education degree training for Pacific Islanders.

All four Pacific Island territory departments of education have developed comprehensive plans for personnel development and are engaged in in-service training. Guam effectively utilizes the University of Guam. The other three departments—Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Trust Territory, and American Samoa--utilize a very effective "on staff" teacher trainer model. Pacific Islanders with advanced degrees and expatriate Americans who have made long term commitments to the islands are used as on-staff trainers. The trainers work with local teachers on a long term, continuous basis on the development of knowledge and skills.

In the future, one should expect an even stronger trend toward programs that utilize Pacific resources. In those areas where the Pacific does not have regional or "in house" resources--such as training for physical therapy--the territories are beginning to look toward their non-American neighbors. As an example, the Guam department of education plans to hire therapists trained in the Philippines. Cooperative interaction with other non-American countries has increased. Some Pacific Island educators view themselves as having more in common with the other "developing" areas of the Pacific.

Positive Trends

In spite of the enormous difficulties of applying comprehensive educational legislation to the Pacific territories, several encouraging trends have been developing within the territories and have been supported by U.S. Office of Special Education officials. A few examples include:

Technical Assistance

Since 1976, the Pacific Basin Consortium, a Title VI-D personnel preparation project, has been funded to provide technical assistance to each of the territories and Hawaii. The Pacific Basin Consortium consists of Pacific special educators with Part D proposals including State Education Agency representatives from each island territory and Hawaii, and Institutes of Higher Education representatives from the University of Guam, University of Hawaii, and Community College of Micronesia. Assistance has ranged from training teachers of the severely handicapped in positioning and handling competencies to preparation of project proposals and internal management procedures. Another project funded by the federal government since 1978, the Resource Access Project of the Pacific (RAPP) brings together territorial Head Start and State Education Agency early childhood officials in order to prepare teachers of young children for incoming special needs populations. Both the Pacific Basin Consortium and the Resource Access Project of the Pacific have been instrumental in identifying common needs and potential solutions, maintaining an intra-regional dialogue and providing assistance in personnel development.

Pre-Service Training

Both the University of Guam and the Community College of Micronesia have developed special education degree programs that collectively include competencies in visual impairments, auditory impairments, mild learning problems, vocational education, and administration. Practicum training sites have been individually designed to account for language and cultural considerations and service delivery methods in the student teachers' home districts. Trainers for speech, occupational, and physical therapy assistants have been recruited from Taiwan, the Philippines, and Japan in an effort to accommodate tight budgets and service needs toward non-traditional services and delivery systems.

In-Service Training

At least one method of in-service training has proven effective within logistic and cultural parameters. American Samoa's utilization of a core of professional teacher trainers within the department of education allows individualized teacher training based on the educational needs of specific students. Trainers are assigned to specific teachers and students, and become IEP managers similar to the educational synthesizer role proposed by Bricker (1976). Teacher training is an extension of student IEPs and occurs on a regular daily basis.

Conclusion

As a national movement for special education reform was evolving from litigation and state legislation to a federal mandate enforced by federal education officials, Pacific educators were utilizing federal funds to develop the first services for exceptional children and youth

in the territories. As enforcement of P.L. 94-142 became a major role in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, the inappropriateness of much of the legislation for the Pacific Basin territories became evident. When writing for U.S. military advisors, Stewart (1976, p. 236) aptly stated: "Transferring concepts from one culture to another is more than the translating of words. Culture differences exist even when members of both cultures speak the same language."

The development of special education in the Pacific has been hindered not only by the cultural factors that impede the transfer of concepts, but by geographic and demographic factors unparalleled on the mainland United States. In spite of enormous difficulties with federal compliance, several efforts initiated by the territorial State Education Agencies have proven quite successful. The future of services for handicapped students in the Pacific territories is dependent upon continued research, development, and negotiation.

Reference Notes

1. American Samoa Government. American Samoa's fiscal year 1979 annual program plan for part B of the education of the handicapped act as amended by public law 94-142. American Samoa: Department of Education, 1979.

2. Robert E., & Varney, S. A research framework for studying the effects of cultural values on administrative behavior. Paper presented to the World Educators Conference, Honolulu and Ponape, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1976.

3. American Samoa Government. Think children. Annual report. American Samoa: Department of Education, 1979.

4. Position Paper on Allowable Uses of Federal Funds from Education of the Handicapped Act in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Unpublished manuscript, Bureau of Education, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, January 10, 1980.

5. Pacific Basin Consortium. PBC report: special education program activities, American Samoa special education division. Unpublished report, Honolulu, 1980.

6. Pacific Basin Consortium for Special Education Personnel Preparation. Program assistance grant proposal, Pacific Basin Consortium, Honolulu, 1980.

7. Pacific Basin Consortium. Personnel need assessment inventory, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Unpublished report, Honolulu, 1980.

References

Bateman, B. Special education in Micronesia: a letter. Division for Children With Learning Disab ities Newsletter, 1972, 31-33.

Bellamy, G. T., & Wilcox, B. Secondary education for severely handicapped students: guidelines for quality services. In B. Wilcox & A. Thompson (Eds.), Critical issues in the education of autistic children and youth. In press.

Bricker, D. D. Educational synthesizer. In M. A. Thomas (Ed.), Hey, don't forget about me! Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Brown, L., Branston, M. B., Hamre-Nietupski, S., Pumpian, I., Certo, N., & Gruenewald, L. A strategy for developing chronological-age-appropriate and functional curricular content for severely handicapped adolescents and young adults. Journal of Special Education, 1979, 13(1), 81-90.

Brown, L., Branston-McClean, M. B., Baumgart, D., Vincent, L., Falvy, M., & Schoeder, J. Using characteristics of current and subsequent least restrictive environments in the development of curricular content for the severely handicapped students. AAESPH Review, 1979, 4(4), 407-424.

Brown, L., Nietupski, J., & Hamre-Nietupski, S. The criterion of ultimate functioning. In M. A. Thomas (Ed.), Hey, don't forget about me! Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Caldwell, M. F. A history of the development of special education in

the United States Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1967-1977. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1979.

Downing, J. Cultural priorities and the acquisition of literacy. International Review of Education, 1973, 19, 345-355

Furuno, S. RAPP speeds mainstreaming program in Trust Territory. Pacific Health, 1980, XIII, 2-4.

Hammill, D. D. The field of learning disabilities: a futuristic perspective. Learning Disability Quarterly, Spring 1980, 3(2), 2-9.

Marsella, A. J. Madness and culture: exporting the cuckoo's nest, (interview). East West Perspectives, Summer 1980, 1(3), 30-36.

Nevin, D. The American touch in micronesia. New York: W. W. Norton & Compancy, Inc., 1977.

Niehoff, A. H. (Ed.). A casebook of social change. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

Sanchez, J. Rehabilitation in paradise: an option. In J. L. Steinberg (Ed.), Cultural factors in the rehabilitation process. Los Angeles: California State University, 1978.

Schipper, W. V., Wilson, W. C., & Wolf, J. M. Public education of the handicapped. In E. Sontag, N. Certo, & J. Smith (Eds.), Educational programming for the severely and profoundly handicapped. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Steinberg, J. L. (Ed.). Cultural factors in the rehabilitation process. Los Angeles: California State University, 1978.

Stewart, E. C. American advisors overseas. In L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: a reader (2nd ed.). Belmont,

California: Wadsworth, 1976.

Stubbins, J. Cross cultural considerations in the rehabilitation of the Navajos and Micronesians. In J. L. Steinberg (Ed.), Cultural factors in the rehabilitation process. Los Angeles: California State University, 1978.

Voeltz, L., & Donellon, S. Some issues in the area of behavioral disorders and the schools in Hawaii and the Pacific Basin. Journal of Behavior Disorders, 1978, 250-267.

Welle, K. Special education teacher training in the United States Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Educational Perspectives, 1979, 18(4), 8-11.

Wolfensberger, W. The principle of normalization in human services. Toronto: National Institute of Mentally Retarded, York University Campus, 1972.

Table 1

Cultural Differences in Individualized Education Planning

Functions	Activities	Value Orientation	
		American	Pacific Islands
Individualized Planning	To provide an opportunity to focus upon the needs of the individual child for the purpose of planning.	Is individual oriented, interested in change, and expects improvement and progress.	Is group oriented, more concerned with the process than the product or outcome.
Planning	To determine goals, objectives, and propose methods or strategies.	Is future oriented, values results and is optimistic about accomplishing objectives.	Is present oriented, idea of planning may conflict with traditional negative aspects of forecasting, tends to focus on meeting day-to-day needs.
Program Decision Making	Setting priorities, determining strategies.	Is concerned about the organization's responsibility to the individual, establishing priorities, and making efficient decisions, becoming more democratic.	Values group or community priorities, selects activities that maintain good relationships, priorities are determined by chance and what "feels" right; may be authoritarian.
Documentation	To commit to papers the educational plan for future reference and evaluation.	Values written material and the direction provided by documentation, will use the document as a standard for future judgement.	Does not value written material, would prefer flexible planning, not interested in extensive evaluation, more likely to leave program to chance.

Note. Table 1 is an adaptation of the work of Robert and Varney (see Note 2).